

Nos. 19-1434, 19-1452, 19-1458

In the Supreme Court of the United States

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Petitioner,

v.

ARTHREX, INC., ET AL.,
Respondents.

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC., ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

ARTHREX, INC., ET AL.,
Respondents.

ARTHREX, INC.,
Petitioner,

v.

SMITH & NEPHEW, INC., ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Writs of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE ENGINE ADVOCACY
AND ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER**

Abigail A. Rives
ENGINE ADVOCACY
700 Pennsylvania Ave. SE
Second Floor
Washington, DC 20003

Alexandra H. Moss
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER
FOUNDATION
815 Eddy Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

Jef Pearlman
Counsel of Record
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY &
TECHNOLOGY LAW CLINIC
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA GOULD
SCHOOL OF LAW
699 Exposition Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90089
(213) 740-7088
jef@law.usc.edu

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
ARGUMENT	4
I. The Federal Circuit Misclassified APJs Because It Overstated APJ Authority and Oversimplified the Principal Officer Analysis.....	4
A. Reading Too Much into <i>Edmond</i> , the Federal Circuit Manufactured a Rigid Test Inconsistent with Precedent and Practical Reality.	5
B. The Federal Circuit’s Failure to Consider the Similarities Between APJs and USPTO Employees Led It to Misclassify APJs as Principal Officers.	7
C. A Healthy and Efficient Patent System Relies on Examiners and APJs Applying Policy Without Creating It.....	14
II. If the Court Concludes APJs are Principal Officers, Judicial Severability Should be Used to Preserve the IPR System Congress Created to Stem the Tide of Abusive Patent Litigation.....	16
A. IPRs Increase Patent Quality, Promote the Public Interest, and Benefit Small Businesses.	17

B. IPRs are Critical to Startups and the Economy Because They Reduce Costs, Reduce Abusive Litigation, and Protect Innovation.....	22
CONCLUSION	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Blonder-Tongue Labs. Inc. v. Univ. Of Ill. Found.</i> , 402 U.S. 313 (1971)	17, 18
<i>Cardinal Chem. Co. v. Morton Int'l, Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 83 (1993)	18
<i>Consumer Watchdog v. Wis. Alumni Research Found.</i> , 753 F.3d 1258 (C.A. Fed. 2014).	20
<i>Cuozzo Speed Techs., LLC v. Lee</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2131 (2016).	14, 21
<i>Edmond v. United States</i> , 520 U.S. 651 (1997)	5, 11
<i>Edward Katzinger Co. v. Chi. Metallic Mfg. Co.</i> , 329 U.S. 394 (1947)	17
<i>Freytag v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue</i> , 501 U.S. 868 (1991)	4, 13
<i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> , 395 U.S. 653 (1969)	18
<i>Lucia v. Sec. and Exch. Comm'n</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2044 (2018)	5
<i>Morrison v. Olson</i> , 487 U.S. 654 (1988)	5, 6, 12
<i>Oil States Energy Servs., LLC v. Greene's Energy Grp.</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1365 (2018)	8, 9, 10, 13

<i>Personal Audio, LLC v. Elec. Frontier Found.</i> , 867 F.3d 1246 (Fed. Cir. 2017)	20
<i>Thryv, Inc. v. Click-To-Call Techs. LP</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1367 (2020)	18
<i>United States v. Gantt</i> , 194 F.3d 987 (9th Cir. 1999)	7
<i>United States v. Hilario</i> , 218 F.3d 19 (1st Cir. 2000)	6

Statutes and Regulations

5 U.S.C. § 7513(a)	12, 13
35 U.S.C. § 3	15
35 U.S.C. § 3(a)(2)(A)	11
35 U.S.C. § 3(b)(4)	7
35 U.S.C. § 6	9
35 U.S.C. § 134 (2006)	15
35 U.S.C. § 141 (2006)	15
35 U.S.C. § 311(a)	19
35 U.S.C. § 311(b)	10
35 U.S.C. § 316(a)	11
35 U.S.C. § 316(c)	9
37 C.F.R. § 1.104	10
37 C.F.R. § 1.105	10
37 C.F.R. § 1.132	10
37 C.F.R. § 1.133	10

Other Authorities

Am. Intellectual Prop. Law Ass'n, <i>2019 Report of the Economic Survey</i> (2019)	26
--	----

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.